

---

**APPENDIX A**  
**Responsiveness Summary**

---

## Overview

On June 26, 1992, a "Dear Citizen" document containing Proposed Plans for three sites at the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory (INEL) was released to the public. This document included a Proposed Plan for the Central Facilities Area (CFA) Motor Pool Pond. The document solicited comments from the public on the plan and announced the public comment period, which was originally July 6 to August 5, 1992. The comment period was later extended to September 8, 1992 in response to a request made due to errors identified in a table in the Proposed Plan. On August 6, 1992, an errata sheet was sent to the individuals who were on the mailing list for the Proposed Plan. Comments from the public on the Proposed Plan were sought by the U.S. Department of Energy, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and Idaho Department of Health and Welfare.

The Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order (FFA/CO) between the three agencies designates the CFA Motor Pool Pond as Waste Area Group (WAG) 4 Operable Unit (OU) 4-11. The FFA/CO identified the site for a Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS).

The Proposed Plan discussed the operable unit background and the risks associated with exposure to contaminants found in the pond sediments. The Remedial Investigation Report, available in the Administrative Record, presents the risk assessment calculations and results. Because the Remedial Investigation Report (and accompanying risk assessment) indicated that contaminants at the site do not pose unacceptable risks to human health or the environment, the DOE, EPA, and IDHW recommended "No Action" for the CFA Motor Pool Pond in the Proposed Plan.

## Background on Community Involvement

During the weeks of June 29 and July 13, 1992, a Notice of Availability advertisement for the Proposed Plan was published in the following Idaho newspapers:

- *The Post Register* (Idaho Falls)
- *The Idaho State Journal* (Pocatello)
- *Times News* (Twin Falls)
- *Idaho Statesman* (Boise)
- *Daily News* (Moscow-Pullman)
- *South Idaho Press* (Burley)
- *The Lewiston Morning Tribune* (Lewiston).

The Proposed Plan was mailed to 6,500 individuals on the INEL mailing list with a cover letter from the Director of the Environmental Restoration Division of the DOE Idaho Field Office, urging citizens to comment on the plan and to attend public meetings. Copies of the plan are available in the Administrative Record file in the INEL Technical Library, 1776 Science Center Drive, Idaho Falls. Copies of the file are also available in the INEL Information Repository section of public libraries in Idaho Falls, Pocatello, Twin Falls, Boise, Shoshone-Bannock Library at Fort Hall, Idaho State Library in Boise, and the University of Idaho Library in Moscow.

Articles about the Proposed Plan for the CFA Motor Pool Pond were printed in the May and July 1992 issues of the *INEL Reporter* newsletter. Public meetings on the Proposed Plan were held July 20 in Idaho Falls, July 21 in Burley, July 22 in Boise, and July 23 in Moscow. An INEL press release was distributed to state-wide media to inform the public of upcoming meetings in their areas. Personal telephone calls were made by INEL Outreach Office personnel in Pocatello, Twin Falls, and Boise to inform community leaders and other interested individuals and groups of the opportunity for public comment.

---

At the meetings, representatives from the DOE, EPA, and IDHW discussed the CFA Motor Pool Pond, answered questions, and received public comment. Verbatim transcripts were prepared by a court reporter at each meeting, and are available in the Administrative Record.

Technical briefings on the Proposed Plan were held July 13 in Twin Falls, July 14 in Moscow, and July 15 in Pocatello. A newspaper advertisement announcing the Moscow briefing appeared in the Moscow/Pullman *Daily News* on July 11. The briefing in Twin Falls was presented to the Twin Falls City Council and general public; the Moscow and Pocatello briefings were presented to the general public.

### **Summary of Comments Received During Public Comment Period**

All oral comments, transcribed verbatim at the public meetings, and all written comments, as submitted, are in the Administrative Record for the Record of Decision. The comments are annotated to indicate which response in this Responsiveness Summary addresses each comment. Responses to the comments received during the public comment period are included in this Responsiveness Summary, and were considered during development of the Record of Decision.

Predominant public opinions on the "No Action" recommendation, as described in the Proposed Plan, were: (1) The "No Action" proposal is unacceptable and contaminants in the pond should be cleaned up, (2) The "No Action" proposal is acceptable and the risk calculations are adequate, and (3) Fragmentation of the INEL into several operable units makes it difficult to evaluate the cumulative risks posed by the various operable units.

Comments and questions raised during the comment period are summarized in this Responsiveness Summary. Oral comments received at the public meetings and submitted written comments have been organized according to the general subject of the comments.

Comments and questions on a variety of subjects not specific to the CFA Motor Pool Pond were also received. These subjects included nuclear waste issues at the INEL, EPA drinking water standards, and the government's recognition of the public's opportunity to participate in the cleanup process.

Comments on public participation have been referred to the INEL Community Relations Plan Coordinator for consideration in the update of the INEL Community Relations Plan. General comments on INEL activities have been referred to the INEL Public Affairs Office. Additional information on these topics may be obtained from the INEL Public Affairs Office in Idaho Falls or from INEL Outreach Offices in Pocatello, Twin Falls, and Boise.

### **Summarized Comments on the CFA Motor Pool Pond**

A comment tracking system has been utilized to aid the public in finding responses to individual comments on the Proposed Plan that were provided during the comment portion of the public meetings or submitted in writing. This system has been initiated by the DOE to respond to public comments concerning responsiveness summaries and is intended to aid the public in reviewing this Record of Decision and Responsiveness Summary. This system is described below.

- During the comment period held on the Proposed Plan, DOE received oral and written comments submitted by members of the public and public officials. A number of common topics and questions emerged.
- To provide a manageable response to comments, questions and comments with similar themes were condensed into a single comment or question. Immediately after each summarized comment, a series of

---

letters and numbers grouped in parentheses. This series of numbers identifies individual comments from the transcripts or written comments. The first two characters of each comment code identifies the transcript, or written document in which the comment is found. (For example, the "T1" in comment T1-01 identifies the comment as being from the first or Idaho Falls transcript.) The second set of numbers (following the hyphen) represents the sequence of the individual comments in the transcript ("T1-1" is the first comment identified in the Idaho Falls transcript).

- Each comment is identified by brackets, the comment code, and the response number to assist individuals in finding their comments and the corresponding responses. A set of indices is also provided that identifies comments by commenter name, comment code, response number, and the page number of the comment.
- The bracketed transcripts and written comments are available for review in the Administrative Record file. Appendix B of the Record of Decision provides the index for cross referencing the Responsiveness Summary with the transcripts and written comments. Appendix C of the Record of Decision contains the Administrative Record index.

### **Public Comments on the CFA Motor Pool Pond Proposed Plan**

1. **Comment:** The "No Action" proposal is unacceptable because the risk to human health is too great. No action should be considered as an alternative only if the risk to human health is deemed to be one or less than one increased cancer per one million people. The risk to human health as presented in Table 2 of the June 26, 1992, "Dear Citizen" letter or its revision, exceeds one in one million increased cancers. It is a simple cleanup that should be done. (T1-2, T4-1, T4-2, T4-3, T4-4, T4-5, T4-10, W6-1, W6-2, W6-3, W6-8)

**Response:** Although removal of the sediments in the pond is possible, the purpose of doing so under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), program, would be to reduce contaminant levels sufficiently to bring the risks to within the acceptable range. The risks to human health and the environment from exposure to CFA Motor Pool Pond sediments were evaluated in accordance with EPA guidance and are within the  $10^{-4}$  to  $10^{-6}$  acceptable risk range established in National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (NCP)(40 Code of Federal Regulations 300). A summary of the risk assessment is in Section 6 of the Record of Decision; a more comprehensive discussion is included in the RI report.

2. **Comment:** The agency decision of "No Action" is noncompliant with applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements. The PCB Aroclor-1260 in concentrations of 1,470  $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$  alone dictates enforceable remedial action of exhuming contaminants to prevent further migration to the aquifer. (T2-1, T4-22, W1-8)

**Response:** Although the PCB standard does not apply as an ARAR where no action is being taken, it may be instructive to compare contaminant levels to available standards. The cleanup standard for PCBs in soils, as established by the Toxic Substances and Control Act (TSCA) program, is 10 parts per million or 10,000 parts per billion. The highest concentration of Aroclor-1260 detected was 1,470 parts per million or 1,470 parts per billion. Therefore, no further action would be required to meet the TSCA standard. However, the "No Action" recommendation was not based on meeting the TSCA standard, but on the results of the risk assessment which indicate that risks from exposure to Aroclor-1260 are within the NCP acceptable range for both carcinogenic and noncarcinogenic effects.

- 
3. **Comment:** Based on the risk calculations and facts presented, DOE, EPA, and IDHW have made the right recommendation. This is especially true in light of the risk calculation that assumes a 250-day exposure, which in itself seems unrealistic [conservative]. (T1-1, T1-3, W2-1, W2-2, W2-3)

**Response:** On the basis of the data collected and the risk assessment calculations, the DOE, EPA, and IDHW agree that the estimated risks are within the acceptable range and that no further action is necessary for the CFA Motor Pool Pond sediments.

4. **Comment:** Either of the following alternatives to the "No Action" proposal are suggested: (a) incineration of contaminated soils under controlled conditions with cement stabilization and disposal of the residuals, or (b) exhuming contaminants, containerizing, and storing the containers at monitored retrievable storage sites, or placing the containers in a permitted repository. (T3-1, T4-6, T4-12, T4-23, W6-4)

**Response:** The objective of evaluating and implementing cleanup alternatives such as those suggested would be to reduce risks to within the acceptable range. Because estimated risks for this OU were within the acceptable range, an evaluation of cleanup alternatives is not required by CERCLA or the NCP.

5. **Comment:** For the following reasons, the model's assumptions for occupational and residential exposures understate risk:

- a) Risk calculations for worker exposure only allow for inhalation at five percent and direct contact at one percent. This is grossly understated due to the close proximity of the pond to the CFA.
- b) Exposure frequencies are based on estimates of outdoor activity of 50 days per year; therefore, exposure beyond 50 days increases the risk. In addition, the risk for houses built on this land was not considered. (T4-11, T4-17, W1-3, W6-2)

**Response:** The site-specific scenarios evaluated for the CFA Motor Pool Pond sediments represent the reasonable maximum exposure, given the limited area of the pond and extent of associated contamination.

- a) The inhalation exposure frequency used for CFA workers was five percent of the EPA default value because data from the meteorology station at CFA indicate that CFA is downwind of the CFA Motor Pool Pond approximately five percent of the time. The exposure frequency for direct contact and other exposure routes was set at one percent (2.5 days per year) of the default value because there are no activities at the CFA Motor Pool Pond that require CFA workers to be routinely on the site. The CFA Motor Pool Pond is permanently deactivated and there are no plans for additional activities. In addition, risk assessment calculations were performed for CFA workers using the more conservative default scenarios as recommended in the EPA risk assessment guidance.
- b) Future residential scenarios assumed a house is constructed adjacent to the pond. The time future residents would spend outdoors is the limiting factor for direct ingestion, dermal contact, and direct ionizing radiation exposures. The amount of time spent outdoors has been estimated in EPA guidance at 50 days per year for men and women (Exposure Factors Handbook, Final Report, U.S. EPA, EPA/600/8-89/043, May 1989). Limited data for children suggest the maximum average time spent outdoors is 14 days per year for boys, ages 12 to 17 years. This average only includes days of the school year; summer vacation time is not included. An average of three days per week outdoors was used as a reasonable estimate at the CFA Motor Pool Pond

---

during the 12-week summer vacation, for totals of 36 days for the summer and 50 days for the entire year. Values of 50 days per year for adults and children are considered to be reasonable for estimating exposures by ingestion, dermal contact, and direct ionizing radiation. Risk assessment calculations using default scenarios were also done on the Motor Pool Pond. Even using the default scenarios, carcinogenic risks were within the acceptable  $10^{-4}$  to  $10^{-6}$  range. The Hazard Index for noncarcinogenic risk for the default future residential scenario was 1.4 which is slightly above the threshold of 1. The Hazard Indices were added across all pathways for all contaminants.

6. **Comment:** It was noted that EPA had the following concerns with regard to the risk assessment methodology in the plan:

- a) Heavy metals such as silver and selenium are not acknowledged.
- b) Cesium is not included in the exposure assessment nor was testing done for alpha and beta emitters at the waste pit.
- c) The use of average values is inconsistent with EPA guidance which requires the use of a 95 percent upper level confidence limit.
- d) The soil to groundwater pathway for contaminant migration was dismissed. (T4-18, T4-19, T4-20, W1-4, W1-5, W1-6, W1-7)

**Response:** Comments from EPA Region 10 and the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare on the Draft Remedial Investigation Report were incorporated into the Final Remedial Investigation Report. The final report was revised to ensure consistency with EPA guidance.

- a) The metals silver and selenium were not included in the risk assessment because they were not detected above naturally occurring levels (or background).
- b) Historical radiation surveys of the Motor Pool Pond included gamma and high-energy beta radiation surveys. Results were slightly above background in surveys of the area conducted prior to 1982. The most recent survey, performed in September 1991, showed only background levels of radiation.

During the remedial investigation, samples were analyzed using both gamma- and alpha-spectroscopy. The radionuclides americium-241, cesium-137, and plutonium-239 were detected in surface sediments in the ditch and pond area. The highest concentrations of each detected radionuclide were 2.72 pCi/g for americium-241, 8.4 pCi/g for cesium-137, and 4.29 pCi/g for plutonium-239.

Radionuclide concentrations were evaluated in the risk assessment for both current occupational and future residential scenarios. Exposure to cesium was included. However, for direct radiation exposure, cesium-137 is not a significant contributor to risk as compared to its daughter product, barium-137, which was also included in the assessment (barium-137 is also commonly reported as cesium-137). The calculated risks from exposure to all detected radionuclides were within the acceptable risk range of  $10^{-4}$  to  $10^{-6}$ .

- 
- c) The Final Remedial Investigation Report was revised to indicate that the risk assessment was performed using the upper 95 percent confidence interval values.
  - d) The Final Remedial Investigation Report was revised to include an evaluation of the soil to groundwater pathway. However, based on the groundwater modeling results, regulatory standards for groundwater would not be exceeded. The groundwater pathway was not included further in this remedial investigation. The potential for groundwater contamination from wastewater previously disposed of at the CFA Motor Pool Pond will be evaluated further in the WAG-4 final RI/FS, which is scheduled to begin in 1996.

7. **Comment:** Averaging the concentrations of contaminants found in different areas seems inappropriate. Using the highest concentrations would change the picture drastically. Revisions to "safe" concentrations for these contaminants have always been downward instead of upward, and it makes more sense to err on the conservative side. (W7-3)

**Response:** For metals and gamma emitting radionuclides, the contaminant concentrations used in the risk assessment were the 95% Upper Confidence Limit (UCL) of the arithmetic mean. The 95% upper confidence limit is "on the conservative side" and in most cases represents the reasonable maximum exposure over the time used to calculate risk.

Because only one sample and its duplicate were available for the PCB Aroclor-1260, the average of these two samples was used for the exposure concentration. There were insufficient data to calculate a representative value for plutonium-123 and americium-241. Therefore, the highest concentration detected by alpha analysis was used.

8. **Comment:** What are "safe" concentrations for all populations, flora, and fauna found on the INEL? The safe concentration level for the harvester ant, for example, is unknown. Yet the conclusion is made that no harm will occur to humans or the environment. This seems inappropriate. (W7-4)

**Response:** It is recognized that risk based contaminations are not established for all flora and fauna found in the INEL. However, a qualitative ecological risk assessment was performed to the extent practicable on a scale as small as the CFA Motor Pool Pond. The assessment included a review of available literature on contaminant toxicity to animal species. Based on the limited distribution of the contaminants, and the lack of water, vegetation, and habitat value, it is unlikely that contaminants will be accumulated in the food chain. For these reasons, the contaminants identified in the CFA Motor Pool Pond sediments are not expected to have significant disruptive effects on animal or plant populations or the local ecosystem. Ecological effects will be further evaluated in the WAG 4 RI/FS and the WAG 10 Comprehensive RI/FS. These studies are broader in scope and will enable a more representative evaluation of varied and mobile populations.

9. **Comment:** Agency plans to clean up the CFA Motor Pool Pond do not accurately acknowledge the source of nor the quantities of significant radioactive contamination of the pit. The DOE's plan states only that on several occasions vehicles and equipment with small amounts of radioactive contamination were decontaminated at the station. Concentrations of cesium-137, americium-241 and plutonium-238, and plutonium-239 as well as cobalt-60, potassium-40, lead-212, and radium-226 are not adequately accounted for. There is already tritium under CFA, so additional contaminant loading from the Motor Pool Pond must not be allowed. (T4-15, W1-1)

---

**Response:** Washing of vehicles and equipment at the Service Station is considered to be the only likely source for radioactive contamination detected at the CFA Motor Pool Pond because the Service Station is the only facility that was connected to the CFA Motor Pool Pond. The CFA, especially the Service Station, is not an area where large amounts of radioactive materials are routinely handled. The risk assessment for the pond was based on the concentration of contaminants in the sediments. The results of groundwater modeling show that regulatory standards, would not be exceeded by contaminants migrating to the aquifer from the pond sediments.

10. **Comment:** The Proposed Plan does not accurately state the volatile organic ranges detected in the pond. The Oak Ridge Survey sampling found 2-butanone at 190 µg/kg, trichloroethane at 25 µg/kg, toluene at 23 µg/kg, methylene chloride at 460 µg/kg, acetone at 85 µg/kg, tetrachloroethylene at 76 µg/kg, and 4-methyl-2-pentanone at greater than 8,300 µg/kg. Nine of the organic contaminants exceed EPA Contract Required Quantification Limit criteria. (T4-16, W1-2)

**Response:** The Proposed Plan is intended to be a summary of highlights of the Remedial Investigation Report, which served as the basis for the Agencies' recommendation. The Remedial Investigation Report is available in the Information Repositories. The 1989 data were used rather than the Oak Ridge data for risk calculations because the 1989 sampling effort was more comprehensive and data quality was better documented. The 1989 maximum concentrations for the contaminants referenced above are: 90 µg/kg for 2-butanone, 25 µg/kg for trichloroethane, 2 µg/kg for toluene, 40 µg/kg for methylene chloride, 85 µg/kg for acetone, 76 µg/kg for tetrachloroethylene, and 40 µg/kg for 4-methyl-2-pentanone. It is acknowledged that several of the contaminants listed in the comments were detected during the Oak Ridge sampling; however, concentrations for tetrachloroethylene and 4-methyl-2-pentanone stated in the comment could not be found.

The volatile organic compounds detected during the 1989 sampling effort were subjected to a concentration-toxicity screen to evaluate their contribution to total risk. The concentration-toxicity screen, which was performed according to EPA guidance, indicated that the volatile organic compounds do not contribute significantly, less than one percent, to total risk. Therefore, these compounds were not evaluated further in the toxicity assessment.

Contract-required quantification limits (CRQLs) are chemical-specific levels that a laboratory contracted to EPA must be able to routinely and reliably detect and quantify. This limit is not a risk-related value.

11. **Comment:** The preliminary assessments of WAG 10 should begin immediately. It is not in the best interest of public health for all toxic, hazardous, and radioactive materials to continue to contaminate the Snake River Aquifer for another seven years before the cumulative consequences of these "No Action" decisions will begin to be evaluated. Continuing evaluation of the cumulative consequences of contamination from each subsequent "No Action" alternative will allow for the earliest detection of an unacceptable risk. This information should be included in the Proposed Plans for each OU in each WAG. This procedure will allow the public to comprehend and track the cumulative risk of the cleanup program as it progresses, rather than wait until the end as it is now scheduled. (T4-7, W6-6, W7-2)

**Response:** It is recognized that cumulative risks from the various sites are an important issue and that it is possible for several sites which do not pose an unacceptable risk on an individual basis to do so if evaluated on a cumulative basis. However, it would depend on several factors such as the percentage of exposure an individual received from each site, and the toxicological effects of the contaminants and exposure pathways at each site. For example, it would not be reasonable to assume that one individual obtains his drinking water from two different wells at the same time. To effectively evaluate the risks in



---

the WAG 10 comprehensive RI/FS, it is necessary to first collect and evaluate data from the individual OUs. This approach was developed in the INEL FFA/CO and agreed upon by the DOE, EPA, and IDHW in accordance with the NCP. The intent was to ensure that all potential contamination sources were evaluated before the comprehensive RI/FS was completed. Data collection for the comprehensive RI/FS has been initiated; however, it is too early to draw conclusions regarding the contribution of individual OUs to overall risk.

12. **Comment:** OUs are related and are not three separate facilities where "No Action" is proposed. DOE needs to treat them as systems that work together, not divide them up and expect the public not to make the connection. The public wants to see how each element fits together. If a source of contamination or portion of a facility will be considered under a separate plan or a separate OU, these relationships must be spelled out in detail in the information provided to the public. The appropriate OU and time-frame for consideration must be identified in the text or as a note. (T4-8, T4-14, W6-7, W7-2)

**Response:** The INEL was divided into several WAGs and OUs to provide an efficient, systematic method for collecting and evaluating information and to focus resources on high priority sites first. This approach was developed by DOE, EPA, and IDHW for the FFA/CO in accordance with the NCP. The FFA/CO was presented to the public for comment during the months of August through October 1991. Section 300.430 of the NCP states that complex sites should generally be addressed in OUs to simplify and expedite investigations and any necessary remedial action at the sites. In recognition, that risk should be evaluated from a larger perspective than each individual site or OU, a comprehensive RI/FS will be performed for each WAG and subsequently, for the entire INEL (WAG 10) to evaluate the contribution of individual elements to cumulative risk. Schedules for addressing each OU and for the comprehensive evaluations are provided in the FFA/CO, which is included in the Administrative Record file. The WAG 4 Comprehensive RI/FS for CFA is scheduled to begin in 1996. This study, along with other WAG-level RI/FSs will then feed into the INEL-wide RI/FS, scheduled to begin in 1998.

13. **Comment:** More information should be provided to the public so that informed decisions can be made; not everyone is able to obtain information from the Administrative Record. (T4-9, T4-13)

**Response:** The purpose of the Proposed Plan is to provide the public with a summary of the Remedial Investigation Report. More detailed information regarding the investigation is included in the Administrative Record, as required by the NCP. Prior to beginning the comment period, copies of the Administrative Record file were placed in Information Repository sections of public libraries, and remain available at the six locations listed on page B-7 of the Proposed Plan.

14. **Comment:** Are new waste ponds being built to replace the Motor Pool Pond? (T3-2)

**Response:** No new pond is planned or needed to replace the CFA Motor Pool Pond. Use of the pond was discontinued in 1985. Wastes that were previously sent to the CFA Motor Pool Pond are now sent to the CFA Sewage Treatment Plant.

15. **Comment:** A 30-day extension to the comment period on the Proposed Plan is requested so that the three agencies may notify the public of an error in the risk assessment summary data in Table 2 of the June 26, 1992, "Dear Citizen" letter. This error came to light at the public meeting held in Moscow on July 23, 1992. To our knowledge, those members of the public who were not in attendance at that meeting have no way of knowing the information on which they are making their comments is in error. The public should be notified of the error and provided with the correct data. (W9-1, W9-2)

---

**Response:** On August 6, 1992, an errata sheet was sent to the individuals who received the Proposed Plan by mail. These individuals were also notified at that time that the comment period would be extended as requested. The comment period was extended from August 5 to September 8, 1992. The extension was required due to errors in a table in the Proposed Plan which overstated risk values.

---

**APPENDIX B**  
**Public Comment/Response List**

---

<u>Name</u>	<u>Comment#</u>	<u>Transcript Page</u>	<u>Category</u>
Chuck Broschious	T4-2	381	ARA-08
Chuck Broschious	T4-3	381	ARA-02
Chuck Broschious	T4-3	382	ARA-02
Chuck Broschious	T4-4	382	ARA-10
Chuck Broschious	T4-5	382	ARA-10
Chuck Broschious	T4-6	382	ARA-02
Chuck Broschious	T4-6	383	ARA-02
Chuck Broschious	T4-7	383	ARA-01
Chuck Broschious	T4-8	383	ARA-01
Chuck Broschious	T4-8	384	ARA-01
Chuck Broschious	W1-1	400	ARA-08
Chuck Broschious	W1-2	400	ARA-02
Chuck Broschious	W1-3	400	ARA-10
Chuck Broschious	W1-4	400	ARA-10
Chuck Broschious	W1-5	400	ARA-02
Chuck Broschious	W1-6	400	ARA-01
Chuck Broschious	W1-7	400	ARA-01
Chuck Broschious	W1-8	401	ARA-03
Chuck Broschious	W1-9	401	ARA-05
Dennis Donnelly	T1-2	105	ARA-08
John Horan	T1-1	77	ARA-07
John Horan	T1-1	78	ARA-07
Lynn Mineur	T4-1A	373	ARA-09
Lynn Mineur	T4-1B	373	ARA-09
Lynn Mineur	T4-1B	374	ARA-09
Lynn Mineur	W6-1	417	ARA-09
Lynn Mineur	W6-2	417	ARA-09
Lynn Mineur	W6-2	418	ARA-09
Bruce Schmalz	W2-1	402	ARA-07
Bruce Schmalz	W2-2	402	ARA-07
Bruce Schmalz	W2-3	402	ARA-07
Patricia and Donald Scott	T4-1	322	ARA-08
Patricia and Donald Scott	W7-1	419	ARA-08
Patricia and Donald Scott	W7-2	419	ARA-09
Patricia and Donald Scott	W7-3	419	ARA-03
Patricia and Donald Scott	W7-4	419	ARA-04
John E. Tanner	T1-3	105	ARA-07
Michael J. Ushman	T3-1	233	ARA-06

---

**APPENDIX C**  
**Administrative Record Index**

---

**IDAHO NATIONAL ENGINEERING LABORATORY  
ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD FILE INDEX**

**CENTRAL FACILITY AREA MOTOR POOL POND  
REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION / FEASIBILITY STUDY OPERABLE UNIT 4-11**

**FILE NUMBER**

**AR1.1 BACKGROUND**

- Document #: 5134  
Title: Technical Memorandum - Future Land Use Scenarios for the Central Facilities Area, INEL  
Author: Pigott, W. R.  
Recipient: N/A  
Date: 07/01/92

**AR3.3 RI/FS WORK PLAN**

- Document #: 5105  
Title: Transmittal - CFA-05 Motor Pool Pond and ARA-01 Chemical Evaporation Pond Schedule  
Author: EPA, Pierre, W.  
Recipient: DOE, Lyle, J. J.  
Date: 02/24/92

**AR3.4 RI REPORTS**

- Document #: EGG-WM-9973  
Title: Final RI for the CFA Motor Pool Pond  
Author: Spry, M. J.  
Recipient: N/A  
Date: 06/01/92

**AR5.1 RECORD OF DECISION**

- Document #: 5232  
Title: Record of Decision for the CFA Motor Pool Pond  
Author: INEL Community Relations  
Recipient: N/A  
Date: 12/10/92

**AR6.1 COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS**

- Document #: ERD1-070-91\*  
Title: Pre-signature Implementation of the CERCLA Interagency Agreement Action Plan  
Author: EPA, Findley, C. E.  
Recipient: DOE, Solecki, J. E.  
Date: 04/19/91

---

**CFA MOTOR POOL POND RI/FS  
OPERABLE UNIT 4-11  
01/22/93**

**FILE NUMBER**

**AR6.1 COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS (continued)**

- Document #: 2919\*  
Title: INEL Action Plan For Implementation of the Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order  
Author: N/A  
Recipient: N/A  
Date: 07/22/91
  
- Document #: 3205\*  
Title: U.S. DOE INEL Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order (FFA/CO)  
Author: N/A  
Recipient: N/A  
Date: 07/22/91
  
- Document #: 1088-06-29-120\*  
Title: U.S. DOE INEL Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order (FFA/CO) W/Citizen's Guide  
Author: N/A  
Recipient: N/A  
Date: 12/04/91
  
- Document #: 3298\*  
Title: Response to comments on the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order  
Author: N/A  
Recipient: N/A  
Date: 02/21/92
  
- Document #: 5163\*  
Title: Administrative Record List of Guidance Documents  
Author: EPA  
Recipient: N/A  
Date: 08/12/92

**AR10.1 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES**

- Document #: 5139  
Title: Request for an extension of the comment period on the Proposed Plan for the Motor Pool Pond at the Central Facilities Area  
Author: League of Women Voters of Moscow  
Recipient: Nygard, Dean  
Date: 07/24/92

---

**CFA MOTOR POOL POND RI/FS  
OPERABLE UNIT 4-11  
01/22/93**

**FILE NUMBER**

**AR10.3 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

- Document #: 5130  
Title: Dear Citizen Pamphlet, Proposed Plan for the Motor Pool Pond  
Author: INEL Community Relations  
Recipient: N/A  
Date: 06/26/92
- Document #: 5136  
Title: Attention: Agencies Seek Public Comment on Three Proposed Plans  
Author: INEL Community Relations  
Recipient: N/A  
Date: 07/01/92
- Document #: 5141  
Title: Page B-6 Correction of the Dear Citizen Pamphlet, Proposed Plan for the Motor Pool Pond  
Author: INEL Community Relations  
Recipient: N/A  
Date: 08/05/92

**AR10.4 PUBLIC MEETING TRANSCRIPTS**

- Document #: 5164-CFA  
Title: Public Comments on the Proposed Plan  
Author: N/A  
Recipient: N/A  
Date: 07/20/92

**AR10.6 PRESS RELEASES**

- Document #: 5142  
Title: DOE NEWS - Public Comment Period Extended on Proposed Plan for Motor Pool Pond Sediments at INEL  
Author: Coe, M.  
Recipient: N/A  
Date: 08/05/92

**\* Document filed in INEL Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order (FFA/CO) Administrative Record Binder**